



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,917	10/08/2003	Pervaiz Lodhie	0418-44	7602

7590 05/03/2005

Irving Keschner
21515 Hawthorne Boulevard
Suite 1150
Torrance, CA 90503

EXAMINER

WARD, JOHN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2875

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/680,917

Applicant(s)

LODHIE ET AL.

Examiner

John A. Ward

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 18 objected to because of the following informalities: the term "said enclosure " lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stark, III et al (US 6,457,270).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Stark, III et al ('270) discloses emergency sign having a circuit board 74 having two opposed ends, a plurality of light emitting diodes 82, and a pair of projections 90 extending outwardly from each of the two opposed end and electrically connected to the LED's.

Regarding claim 2, Stark discloses a tubular sheath housing 42 having a substantially translucent region (figure 9).

Regarding claims 3-6, Stark shows in figure 1, a pair of end caps 178 located at opposite end of the sheath and holds the circuit board in place by an end cap 65, 306 that hold the circuit board in place.

Regarding claim 7-9, Stark shows in figure 4 a pair of pins configured in parallel extending outwardly connecting to a bi-pin lamp holder by a terminal 74 electrically connecting to the light emitting diodes.

Regarding claim 18, Stark shows an enclosure 30 to allow the light from the light emitting diode to emit light and a lens 36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 11-16 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark, III et al.

Regarding claims 13 and 15, Stark, III et al ('270) discloses emergency sign having a circuit board 74 having two opposed ends, a plurality of light emitting diodes 82, other components 80 and power supply and a pair of projections 90 extending outwardly from each of the two opposed end and electrically connected to the LED's.

Regarding claims 11, 12, 14 and 16, Stark discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention except the cited frequency of the LED's, an array of light emitting diodes, and how the LED's are arranged on the printed circuit board.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the light emitting diodes having a color frequency as cited, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205, USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 14 and 16 it has been held that a mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claim 20, the cover of the sheath being either transparent or translucent, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205, USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark, III et al.

Regarding claim 17, Stark, III et al ('270) discloses emergency sign having a circuit board 74 having two opposed ends, a plurality of light emitting diodes 82, an enclosure 32 and a pair of projections 90 extending outwardly from each of the two opposed end and electrically connected to the LED's.

Regarding claims 21, Stark shows in figure 1, a pair of end caps 178 located at opposite end of the sheath and holds the circuit board in place by an end cap 65, 306 that hold the circuit board in place.

Regarding claim 19, Stark shows an enclosure 30 to allow the light from the light emitting diode to emit light and a lens 36.

Regarding claim 17, Stark shows all the limitations of the claimed invention but does not show two arrays of light emitting diodes, it has been held that a mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cassidy et al (US 5,661,374), Hunter (US 6,283,612), Katogi et al (US 6,659,622).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Ward whose telephone number is 571-272-2386. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAW
April 29, 2005



JOHN ANTHONY WARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER